

1 ANDREW BAUM - State Bar No. 190397  
2 abaum@glaserweil.com  
3 ALAINA BIRD - State Bar No. 318044  
4 abird@glaserweil.com  
5 GLASER WEIL FINK HOWARD  
6 JORDAN & SHAPIRO LLP  
7 10250 Constellation Boulevard, 19th Floor  
8 Los Angeles, California 90067  
9 Telephone: (310) 553-3000  
10 Facsimile: (310) 556-2920

11 *Attorneys for Defendants Robert Luna,  
12 Kathryn Barger, Janice Hahn, Holly Mitchell,  
13 Hilda Solis, Lindsey Horvath, and Hugo Macias*

14  
15 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
16 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
17 WESTERN DIVISION

18 J.L. BOYD, R. CAMOU, and C.  
19 ROBINSON,

20 Plaintiffs,

21 v.

22 ROBERT LUNA, KATHRYN BARGER,  
23 JANICE HAHN, HOLLY MITCHELL,  
24 HILDA SOLIS, LINDSEY HORVATH,  
25 HUGO MACIAS, and 9 UNKNOWN  
26 NAMED DEFENDANTS,

27 Defendants.

28 CASE NO.: 2:24-cv-05716-SPG-AJR  
Hon. Sherilyn Peace Garnett

**DEFENDANTS' EVIDENTIARY  
OBJECTIONS AND REQUEST TO  
STRIKE PLAINTIFFS' RULE 28(J)  
ANALOG IN SUPPORT OF  
MOTIONS FOR CLASS  
CERTIFICATION AND  
PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION  
(DKT. 43)**

*[Proposed] Order filed concurrently  
herewith*

GlaserWeil

1 Defendants Robert Luna, Kathryn Barger, Janice Hahn, Holly Mitchell, Hilda  
2 Solis, Lindsey Horvath, and Hugo Macias (“Defendants”) hereby object to, and  
3 respectfully request that the Court strike, Plaintiffs’ “Rule 28(j) Analog” in support of  
4 their pending motions for class certification and a preliminary injunction. (*See* Dkt. 43.)

5 Presently fully briefed and pending before the Court are Plaintiffs’ motions for  
6 class certification and a preliminary injunction. The class certification motion was fully  
7 briefed on September 9, 2024. (*See* Dkt. 31.) The motion for preliminary injunction  
8 was fully briefed on September 16, 2024. (*See* Dkt. 35.)

9 One month later, on October 13, 2024, Plaintiffs filed Docket No. 43, which is  
10 captioned “Plaintiff’s Rule 28(j) Analog in Support of Motions for Class Certification  
11 and Preliminary Injunction.” Defendants object to this document, and request that it be  
12 stricken, for three reasons.

13 First, this document was purportedly filed pursuant to Rule 28(j) of the Federal  
14 Rules of Appellate Procedure. Those rules are not applicable in this action, and there is  
15 no provision in the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure providing for Plaintiffs’  
16 submission.

17 Second, Plaintiffs’ submission denies Defendants the ability to submit an  
18 authorized response in violation of their due process rights. *See T.L. v. Orange Unified*  
19 *Sch. Dist.*, 2024 WL 305387, at \*1 n.1 (C.D. Cal. Jan. 9, 2024) (“The court finds no  
20 reason to depart from the general principle that the court does not consider new  
21 evidence or argument first submitted on reply”); *see also, e.g., Zamani v. Carnes*, 491  
22 F.3d 990, 997 (9th Cir. 2007) (“The district court need not consider arguments raised  
23 for the first time in a reply brief.”); *FT Travel--N.Y., LLC v. Your Travel Ctr., Inc.*, 112  
24 F. Supp. 3d 1063, 1079 (C.D. Cal. 2015) (“Courts decline to consider arguments that  
25 are raised for the first time in reply.”); *Sliding Door Co. v. Glass Door Co., Inc.*, 2023  
26 WL 4763330, at \*3 n.3 (C.D. Cal. July 11, 2023) (disregarding arguments and evidence  
27 raised for the first time on reply in order denying motion for preliminary injunction);  
28 *Stuart v. Cnty. of Riverside*, 2024 WL 3455263, at \*10 n.15 (C.D. Cal. Apr. 22, 2024)

1 (Garnett, J.) (citing *Zamani* for the proposition that arguments not raised in opening  
2 briefing can be disregarded); *Wallster, Inc. v. Redbubble, Inc.*, 2022 WL 17371051, at  
3 \*5 n.4 (C.D. Cal. Oct. 21, 2022) (Garnett, J.) (declining to consider argument raised for  
4 the first time in reply brief).

5 Third, the submission merely attaches an article from the *Los Angeles Times*. The  
6 article is irrelevant to the pending motions. *See Fed. R. Evid. 402*. And the article is  
7 entirely hearsay, including multiple instances of hearsay within hearsay. *See Fed. R.*  
8 *Evid. 802*. Indeed, the excerpts that Plaintiffs underlined and highlighted for the Court  
9 are hearsay and contain hearsay within hearsay. Newspaper articles have previously  
10 been found to be inadmissible hearsay. *See, e.g., Perry v. Kemna*, 356 F.3d 880, 889  
11 (8th Cir. 2004).

12 For the foregoing reasons, Defendants respectfully request that the Court strike  
13 Plaintiffs' Rule 28(j) Analog (Dkt. 43) in its entirety.

14  
15 DATED: October 18, 2024

GLASER WEIL FINK HOWARD  
JORDAN & SHAPIRO LLP

16  
17 By: /s/ Andrew Baum  
18 ANDREW BAUM  
19 ALAINA BIRD

20 Attorneys for Defendants  
21 Robert Luna, Kathryn Barger, Janice Hahn,  
Holly Mitchell, Hilda Solis, Lindsey  
Horvath, and Hugo Macias